

REMARKS

Claims 45-54 are presented for consideration, with Claims 45, 48 and 51-54 being independent.

Initially, Applicant would like to express appreciation for the courtesies extended to his representatives during the personal interview held on January 7, 2009. At the interview, Applicant's representatives reviewed the claimed subject matter as set forth in claim 45 and explained how the claim distinguished over the applied references.

Specifically, Applicant's representatives pointed out that Kurachi does not teach or suggest, among other features, decrypting user information included in an access ticket received together with the print data, particularly with the access ticket being issued from a directory server that is separate from an information processing apparatus. The claims have been amended to better emphasize this feature of the invention, as suggested by the Examiner.

Further, Applicant's representatives discussed how Kurachi does not teach or suggest decrypting user information in a second access ticket received with a management command and determining whether user information included in this second access ticket received together with a deletion instruction corresponds to user information included in a first access ticket received together with the print data. Claims 45, 48 and 51 have been amended to more clearly set forth this distinction.

The amendments to the claims were not presented earlier as it was believed that the previously presented claims would be found allowable. This Amendment does not add

any additional claims. Moreover, the Examiner's familiarity with the subject matter of the present application will allow an appreciation of the significance of the amendments herein without undue expenditure of time and effort. Finally, the Amendment does not raise new issues requiring a substantial amount of further consideration or search. Accordingly, it is submitted that consideration and entry of the Amendment is appropriate.

Claims 45, 47, 48, 50 and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,181,436, to Kurachi. Claims 46 and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Kurachi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,819,047, to Bauer et al. Claims 52-54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Kurachi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,667,816, to Van Buren et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant's invention, as set forth in Claim 45, relates to a method of controlling peripheral equipment connected to a network and managed by a directory server on the network, including a first receiving step of receiving a print job issued from an information processing apparatus on the network together with a first access ticket issued from the directory server, with the directory server being separate from the information processing apparatus, a storing step of storing the print job received in the first receiving step to a storing medium, and a first decrypting step of decrypting the first access ticket received together with the print job in the first receiving step. A first control step determines validity of the first access ticket received in the first receiving step based on the decrypting result and limits execution of the received print

job, a second receiving step receives a management command from an information processing apparatus on the network together with a second access ticket issued from the directory server, at timing independent of the first receiving step with the directory server being separate from the information processing apparatus, and a second decrypting step decrypts the second access ticket received together with the management command. An additional step includes a second control step of determining validity of the second access ticket received in the second receiving step based on the decrypting result of the second decrypting step and limiting execution of the management command. In the case where the management command received in the second receiving step is one for deleting a specified print job stored in the storing medium, the second control step determines whether or not user information in the decryption results of the second decrypting step corresponds to user information in the decryption results of the first decrypting step and limits execution of deleting the specified print job in the storing medium.

Claims 48 and 51 are directed to a peripheral equipment apparatus and a computer-readable storage medium, respectively, and correspond to Claim 45.

Claim 52 relates to a method of controlling peripheral equipment connected to a network and managed by a directory server on the network, including a first receiving step of receiving a print job issued from an information processing apparatus on the network together with an access ticket issued from the directory server, with the directory serve being separate from the information processing apparatus, a storing step of storing the print job received in the first receiving step to a storing medium, and a first decrypting step of decrypting the access ticket

received together with the print job in the first receiving step. Additional steps includes a first control step of determining validity of the access ticket received in the first receiving step based on the decrypting result of the first decrypting step and limiting execution of the print job received in the first receiving step, an obtaining step of obtaining from the directory server, access information corresponding to a specified user, an inputting step of inputting a management command from an operation panel of the peripheral equipment, and a second control step of determining validity of the access information obtained in the obtaining step and limiting execution of the management command. In the case where the management command inputted in the inputting step is one for deleting a specified print job stored in the storing medium, the second control step determines whether or not user information in the access information corresponds to user information in the decryption results of the first decrypting step and limits execution of deleting the specified print job in the storing medium.

Claims 53 and 54 relate to a peripheral equipment apparatus and a computer-readable storage medium, respectively, and correspond to Claim 52.

The present invention, as recited in independent Claims 45, 48 and 51-54, is directed toward user authentication. In this regard, the present invention determines (1) whether a user sending a print job is qualified to execute the print job, (2) whether a user sending a management command is qualified to execute the management command, and (3) whether the user sending a deletion command corresponds to the user sending the print job.

Kurachi, on the other hand, is directed toward secret communication. Kurachi teaches encryption of communication data, e.g., print data transmitted from a computer to a printer or rough images transmitted from a printer to a computer. In Kurachi, a print data receiving device 3a receives encrypted print data, and a print data decryption device 203j decrypts the printed data. An instruction receiving device 3i receives an instruction and sends the instruction to the print job managing device 3c. Kurachi, however, fails to teach or suggest, among other features, receiving a print job issued from an information processing apparatus on the network together with a first access ticket issued from the directory server, with the directory server being separate from the information processing apparatus, a feature now set forth in each of Applicants' independent claims. As can be seen in Fig. 3 of Kurachi, the directory server (print data generation device 1a) is located in the information processing apparatus.

Further, Kurachi does teach that the instruction includes a deletion instruction, but fails to teach or suggest determining whether or not user information in the decryption results of the second decrypting step corresponds to user information in the decryption results of the first decrypting step, as in Claims 45, 48 and 51, or determining whether or not user information in the access information corresponds to user information in the decryption results, as in Claims 52-54, and based on this determination, limits execution of deleting the specified print job in the storing medium. In Kurachi, a delete instruction issued by another user may be executed. Kurachi, therefore, fails to teach or suggest many features of the present invention as recited in independent Claims 45, 48 and 51.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 45, 47, 48, 50 and 51 under 35 U.S.C. §103, in view of Kurachi, is respectfully requested.

Bauer et al. and Van Buren et al. fail to remedy the above deficiencies of Kurachi. Bauer et al. is relied on for teaching decryption results that include information about a permitted number of prints. Van Buren et al. teaches a data file may not be removed except by the user himself or a manager of the apparatus (Column 7, lines 1-8).

The combination of Kurachi and Bauer et al., however, even if proper, still fails to teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 46 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. §103, therefore, is respectfully requested.

The proposed combination of Kurachi and Van Buren et al. fails to teach or suggest Applicant's invention as set forth in Claims 52-54, and thus consideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

Thus, it is submitted that Applicant's invention as set forth in independent Claims 45, 48 and 51-54 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claims 46, 47, 49 and 50 set forth additional features of Applicant's invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application is deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Malpede/

Scott D. Malpede
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,533

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

SDM\maw\rnn

FCHS_WS 2812828v1